arXiv:1510.05790v1 [q-fin.PM] 20 Oct 2015

Portfolio optimization of Omega measure under a jointly normal distribution

Michael R. Metel * Traian A. Pirvu† Julian Wong‡

October 21, 2015

Abstract

We prove that the Omega measure, which considers all moments when assessing portfolio performance, is equivalent to the widely used Sharpe ratio under a jointly normal distribution. Portfolio optimization of the Sharpe ratio is explored, with a novel active-set algorithm presented for markets prohibiting short sales. Experimental results show an improvement in average solution time of over an order of magnitude when compared to standard optimization techniques.

1 Introduction

In the modern world of finance, it is routine for investors, firms and companies to manage different financial assets in the hope of increasing their capital gain. The collection of such investments is known as a portfolio, and it is designed to match the investor's preference. Different compositions of varying assets allow for a diversity of combinations that suit distinct appetites. For example, a bulge bracket investment bank such as J.P. Morgan is willing to undertake more risk to compensate for a larger return, in comparison to a retired worker who is overseeing his retirement fund. However, despite an individual's taste, investors face the tradeoff between reward and risk, as a high reward investment is often tightly linked with high underlying risk. The main goal of portfolio management is thus to decide the optimal tradeoff between profit return and bearing risk.

The mean-variance portfolio model, proposed by Harry Markowitz [4] serves as the keystone to portfolio theory. He formalized the problem of a rational, risk adverse investor that faces the tradeoff between reward and risk as proposed above. In such a scenario, reward and risk are defined as the expected return from the portfolio and its variance. Under this framework, various major portfolio theories have sprouted, and one of the major developments proposed by William F. Sharpe [6] is known as the Sharpe ratio. The Sharpe ratio is the most fundamental of performance measures,

*School of Computational Science and Engineering, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON, L8S 4K1, Canada, metelm@mcmaster.ca

†Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON, L8S 4K1, Canada, tpirvu@math.mcmaster.ca

‡Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON, L8S 4K1, Canada, julianwwong@gmail.com

which are critical in the evaluation, management and trading of portfolios. Under the mean-variance portfolio framework, the Sharpe ratio compares the return of the portfolio with the risk-free interest rate, which serves as a significant benchmark, owing to the fact that if overall return of the portfolio ranks below the risk free rate, investors should put their capital in the money market and earn interest without bearing any risk. The Sharpe ratio is greatly incorporated as a modern investment strategy, and is highly appraised by investors. However, the Sharpe ratio only comprises and examines the first two moments of the return distribution, namely the expected return and the variance in return, while distribution properties such as skewness and kurtosis, which measure asymmetry and thickness of the tail distribution at the third and fourth moments respectively, may profoundly impact the performance of the portfolio. The failure of the Sharpe ratio to address higher moments motivated Shadwick and Keating [3] to develop the Omega measure, which captures all moments of the return distribution, including the expected value and variance. The Omega measure serves as a universal performance measure as it can be applied to any portfolio that follows a well-defined return distribution.

Even though the Omega measure was developed over 10 years ago, little research has been done to address the compatibility of the Omega measure with previous developments, namely with distribution functions that only involve lower moments. This paper aims to explore and address the backward compatibility of the Omega measure. We consider a financial market encompassing several stocks within a one period paradigm. The stock returns are assumed to follow a jointly normal distribution. Under this framework we prove that the Sharpe ratio and the Omega measure yield the same optimal portfolios. Next, Sharpe ratio portfolio optimization is explored. The quasi-concavity of the Sharpe ratio is employed to develop an active-set algorithm for markets banning short sales. The convergence of this algorithm is established and numerical results are presented.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we present the model. Section 3 provides the Sharpe ratio and Omega measure equivalence. Portfolio optimization formulations are presented in Section 4. Numerical analysis is performed in Section 5, with numerical results in Section 6. The conclusion is summarized in Section 7. The paper ends with an Appendix containing the proofs.

2 Model

We have a financial market model which encompasses several stocks denoted $S_1, ..., S_n$. We consider a single period model from time $t = 0$ to $t = 1$. For each stock, let the arithmetic return be

$$R_i = \frac{S_i(1) - S_i(0)}{S_i(0)} \tag{2.1}$$

We assume the return of the portfolio follows a jointly normal distribution with mean $\mu = [\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_n]$ and a variance covariance matrix Σ. Then a portfolio at times $t = 0$ and $t = 1$ will respectively be

$$X(0) = \Delta_1 S_1(0) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(0)$$
$$X(1) = \Delta_1 S_1(1) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(1)$$

Let the arithmetic return of the portfolio be

$$R = \frac{X(1) - X(0)}{X(0)}.$$

The following Lemma gives the distribution of R.

Lemma 2.1. Let

$$w_i = \frac{\Delta_i S_i(0)}{\Delta_1 S_1(0) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(0)}$$

be the proportion of the initial wealth invested in stock i, and w be the vector with components w_i. Then R follows a normal distribution

$$R \sim N(w^T \mu, w^T \Sigma w) \tag{2.2}$$

where μ is the vector of μ_i and Σ is the variance covariance matrix of stock returns.

Proof. See The Appendix ■

Let us consider the Sharpe Ratio and Omega measure defined by the formal definitions.

Definition 2.2. The Sharpe ratio of a portfolio with return R is defined to be

$$S(R) = \frac{\mu - r_f}{\sigma} \tag{2.3}$$

where μ is the expected return of the portfolio, σ is the standard deviation of return, and r_f is the risk-free interest rate.

Definition 2.3. The Omega measure of a portfolio with return R is defined as such

$$\Omega(R) = \frac{\int_L^\infty (1 - F(x))dx}{\int_{-\infty}^L F(x)dx}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $F(x)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the return distribution R, and L is an exogenously satisfied benchmark index.

The intuition behind the Omega measure is simple; by selecting a benchmark L, which serves as a reference that our portfolio is aiming to beat, the Omega measure compares the area of the cumulative distribution function from the right of L to the area to the left of L. Under such a definition, the Omega measure encompasses the entire return distribution, therefore incorporating higher moment properties as discussed.

3 Sharpe Ratio and Omega Measure Equivalence

When holding a portfolio, an investor uses a performance measure such as the Sharpe ratio or the Omega measure to evaluate how well the portfolio is performing. Hence it is a natural question to ask how one should distribute his wealth in order to maximize his portfolio under the Omega measure. The following is our main result, which says that using the Sharpe ratio or the Omega measure to optimize portfolio performance leads to the same optimal portfolio.

Theorem 3.1. Recall that under our framework the portfolio return R is normally distributed $R \sim N(w^T\mu, w^T\Sigma w)$. If $r_f = L$ we claim that

$$\max_{w_1,..,w_n} \Omega(R)$$

is equivalent to

$$\max_{w_1,..,w_n} S(R).$$

Proof. See The Appendix ■

4 Portfolio Optimization

Given Theorem 3.1, we are able to transform optimization problems of the Omega measure into optimization problems of the Sharpe ratio. Let $e = \mu - L$, the excess expected return above a selected benchmark index L. With no restrictions on short selling, our optimization problem is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \max \ & \frac{w^T e}{\sqrt{w^T \Sigma w}} \\ \text{s.t.} \ & \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1 \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

However, certain markets prohibit the act of short selling, especially during periods of financial upheaval. An example would be the U.S. securities market under the 2008 financial crisis, when the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission prohibited the act of short selling to protect the integrity of the securities market. Hence we are also interested in the following problem as well.

$$\begin{aligned} \max \ & \frac{w^T e}{\sqrt{w^T \Sigma w}} \\ \text{s.t.} \ & \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1 \\ & w_i \geq 0 \qquad i = 1, ..., n \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

5 Numerical Analysis

By the extended Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\underset{w}{\text{argmax}} \frac{w^T e}{\sqrt{w^T \Sigma w}} = c\Sigma^{-1} e \tag{5.1}$$

for any constant $c \neq 0$. Taking $\hat{w} = \Sigma^{-1} e$, the optimal solution to (4.1) is $w^* = \frac{\hat{w}}{\sum_i^n \hat{w}_i}$, and if it so happens that $w^* \geq 0$, then it is also optimal in (4.2). Otherwise, the first step to develop an algorithm for solving (4.2) is realizing the following property of the Sharpe ratio.

Proposition 5.1. The Sharpe ratio $S(w) = \frac{w^T e}{\sqrt{w^T \Sigma w}}$ is a quasi-concave function.

Proof. See The Appendix ■

Furthermore, since for (4.2)

$$w^* \neq c\Sigma^{-1}e, \qquad \nabla S(w^*) \neq 0,$$

and so the following theorem is applicable.

Theorem 5.2 (Arrow & Enthroven [1])**.** Let $f(x)$ be a differentiable quasi-concave function subject to non-negativity constraints. If $\nabla f(x^*) \neq 0$ and x^* satisfies the KKT conditions with constants μ^*, then it is a global optimal solution.

The KKT conditions for (4.2) are as follows.

$$\frac{e}{\sqrt{w^T\Sigma w}} - \frac{w^T e\Sigma w}{(w^T\Sigma w)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \mu = 0 \tag{5.2}$$

$$w \geq 0 \tag{5.3}$$

$$\mu \geq 0 \tag{5.4}$$

$$\mu^T w = 0 \tag{5.5}$$

Consider the sets P and W defined by

$$P := \{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : w_i > 0\}$$

$$W := \{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : w_i = 0\}$$

Let us permute the data so that

$$e = [e_P; e_W], \qquad w = [w_P; w_W]$$

and let Σ_P be the covariance matrix of the securities indexed by P. Let $|P|$ be the number of elements of P. At optimality, the first $|P|$ rows of (5.2) will equal

$$e_P - \frac{w_P^T e_P \Sigma_P w_P}{w_P^T \Sigma_P w_P} = 0,$$

with solution

$$w_P = c\Sigma_P^{-1} e_P, \text{ for } c \neq 0.$$

Therefore the optimal solution of (4.2) is the optimal solution of (4.1) for some unknown subset of securites P. For ease in what follows, we will always take $c = 1$.

We propose the use of the following active-set algorithm to solve (4.2), which is inspired by Algorithm 16.3 in [5].

Algorithm 1 Sharpe Ratio active-set (SRAS) algorithm

$i = 0$
$w^i = \mathbf{0}$
$j = \text{argmax} \frac{e_j}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{jj}}}$
$w^i_j = \frac{e_j}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{jj}}}$
$W^i = \{j | w^i_j = 0\}$
$P^i = \{j | w^i_j > 0\}$
loop
  $x^i = \mathbf{0}$
  $x^i_{P^i} = \Sigma^{-1}_{P^i} e_{P^i}$
  $p^i = x^i - w^i$
  if $p^i = 0$ **then**
    $\mu^i_{W^i} = \frac{w^{iT} e (\Sigma w^i)_{W^i}}{(w^{iT} \Sigma w^i)^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \frac{e_{W^i}}{\sqrt{w^{iT} \Sigma w^i}}$
    if $\mu^i_j \geq 0 \; \forall j \in W^i$ **then**
      quit
    else
      $k^i = \underset{j \in W^i}{\text{argmin}} \, \mu^i_j$
      $W^{i+1} = W^i \setminus \{k^i\}$
      $P^{i+1} = P^i \cup \{k^i\}$
      $w^{i+1} = w^i$
    end if
  else
    $\alpha^i = \min\{1, \underset{j \in P^i, p^i_j < 0}{\min} \frac{-w^i_j}{p^i_j}\}$
    if $\alpha^i < 1$ **then**
      $h^i = \underset{j \in P^i, p^i_j < 0}{\text{argmin}} \frac{-w^i_j}{p^i_j}$
      $W^{i+1} = W^i \cup \{h^i\}$
      $P^{i+1} = P^i \setminus \{h^i\}$
    end if
    $w^{i+1} = w^i + \alpha^i p^i$
  end if
  $i = i + 1$
end loop
$w^* = \frac{w^i}{\sum_{j=1}^n w^i_j}$

At iteration i, $w^i_j = 0$ is imposed for $j \in W^i$, with x^i set to maximize the Sharpe ratio, which in general is not feasible in (4.2). If the current feasible solution $w^i = x^i$, we check if $\mu^i_{W^i} \geq 0$. If so, then

$$w^* = \frac{w^i}{\sum_{j=1}^n w^i_j}$$

is the optimal solution to (4.2), or else we remove the index of the minimum value of μ^i from W^i to form W^{i+1}. If $w^i \neq x^i$, w^{i+1} is set by moving in the direction of x^{i+1} from w^i, while remaining feasible in (4.2). If $w^{i+1} \neq x^{i+1}$, the index of the first w^i_j, for $j \in P^i$ to equal zero on the path is added to W^i to create W^{i+1}.

Theorem 5.3. The SRAS algorithm is convergent.

6 Numerical Results

A computational experiment was conducted whereby the SRAS algorithm was compared to 'fmincon' in Matlab on 50 random instances of a market with 500 securities. All computing was conducted using Matlab R2012a on a Windows 7 Home Premium 64-bit, Intel Core i5-2320 3GHz processor with 8 GB of RAM.

For each test instance, a random vector of expected excess returns was generated from a uniform distribution on the interval $[0, 0.4]$. Given e_i, the standard deviation of security i was modeled as being uniformly distributed on the interval $[0.2, 0.4] * e_i$. A random correlation matrix was generated using the random Gram matrix approach [2].

'fmincon' contains 4 different solvers, each of which were tested with the same initial feasible solution as SRAS, namely the optimal portfolio of size 1. From the results we observe that the average computing time of SRAS is over an order of magnitude faster when compared to standard optimization techniques (Ave Comp Time), and in the worst instance required less than 3 seconds to find the optimal solution (Max Comp Time). Solution times for 'fmincon' are lower bounds as the solvers quit after a fixed number of iterations. Ave Opt Gap is the average percentage optimality gap for each solver.

Numerical Results					
		fmincon			
	SRAS	**active-set**	**interior-point**	**trust-region-reflective**	**sqp**
Ave Comp Time	2.4998	173.5732	160.2699	42.3790	124.6651
Max Comp Time	2.9300	318.4257	558.3410	115.2431	210.6949
Ave Opt Gap	-	0.0025	0.2606	0.0000	0.0005

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proved the equivalence of the Omega measure and the Sharpe ratio under a jointly normal distribution. The portfolio optimization of the Sharpe ratio with and without short sales was numerically analyzed. An active-set algorithm was presented for markets prohibiting short sales, with an improvement in average solution time of over an order of magnitude when compared to standard optimization techniques.

References

[1] K. J. Arrow and A. C. Enthoven. Quasi-Concave Programming. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 29(4):779–800, 1961.

[2] R. B. Holmes. On Random Correlation Matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 12(2):239–272, 1991.

[3] C. Keating and W. F. Shadwick. A Universal Performance Measure. *The Financial Development Centre, London, 2002.*

[4] H. M. Markowitz. *Portfolio Selection: Efficient Diversification of Investments.* Yale University Press, 1968.

[5] J. Nocedal and S. Wright. *Numerical Optimization.* Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[6] W. F. Sharpe. Mutual Fund Performance. *The Journal of Business*, pages 119–138, 1966.

8 Appendix

Proof. of Lemma 2.1

$$\begin{aligned}
R &= \frac{\Delta_1 S_1(1) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(1) - (\Delta_1 S_1(0) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(0))}{\Delta_1 S_1(0) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(0)} \\
&= \frac{\Delta_1 S_1(1) - \Delta_1 S_1(0)}{\Delta_1 S_1(0) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(0)} + \cdots + \frac{\Delta_n S_n(1) - \Delta_n S_n(0)}{\Delta_1 S_1(0) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(0)} \\
&= S_1(1) - S_1(0) \left(\frac{\Delta_1}{\Delta_1 S_1(0) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(0)} \right) + \cdots + S_n(1) - S_n(0) \left(\frac{\Delta_n}{\Delta_1 S_1(0) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(0)} \right) \\
&= \frac{S_1(1) - S_1(0)}{S_1(0)} \left(\frac{\Delta_1 S_1(0)}{\Delta_1 S_1(0) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(0)} \right) + \cdots + \frac{S_n(1) - S_n(0)}{S_n(0)} \left(\frac{\Delta_n S_n(0)}{\Delta_1 S_1(0) + \cdots + \Delta_n S_n(0)} \right) \\
&= w_1 R_1 + \cdots + w_n R_n
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the return of the portfolio R is a linear combination of $R_1, \cdots, R_n$. The claim now yields. ■

Proof. of Theorem 3.1

Under our framework, we are now able to simplify the Omega measure. Recall the Omega measure is defined as

$$\Omega(R) = \frac{\int_L^\infty (1 - F(x))dx}{\int_{-\infty}^L F(x)dx}.$$

Here $F(x)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the portfolio with arithmetic return R. Let

$$\widehat{\mu} = w^T \mu \ \ and \ \ \widehat{\sigma} = \sqrt{w^T \Sigma w},$$

then under the jointly normal distribution

$$F(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dr$$

Thus

$$\Omega(R) = \frac{\int_L^\infty \left(1 - \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dr dx\right)}{\int_{-\infty}^L \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dr dx}$$

and

$$= \frac{\int_L^\infty \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dr dx}{\int_{-\infty}^L \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dr dx} \tag{8.1}$$

We use Fubini's theorem to change the order of integration. Let D_1 be the integration region of the integral in the numerator and let D_2 be the integration region of the integral in the denominator, then

$$D_1 = \{(x,r)|x \in (L,\infty), r \in (x,\infty)\} = \{(x,r)|x \in (L,r), r \in (L,\infty)\}$$

and

$$D_2 = \{(x,r)|x \in (-\infty,L), r \in (-\infty,x)\} = \{(x,r)|x \in (r,L), r \in (-\infty,L)\}$$

Thus, by Fubini's Theorem

$$\Omega(R) = \frac{\int_L^\infty \int_L^r \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dx dr}{\int_{-\infty}^L \int_r^L \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dx dr} \tag{8.2}$$

Evaluating the upper integral gives us

$$\begin{aligned}\int_L^\infty \int_L^r \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dx dr &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} \int_L^\infty (r-L) e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dr \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} \int_L^\infty r e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dr - \frac{L}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} \int_L^\infty e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dr.\end{aligned}$$

Let us perform the change of variable. Therefore, we let $u = \frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}$, then $\widehat{\sigma} du = dr$ and $r = \widehat{\sigma}u + \widehat{\mu}$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_L^\infty \int_L^r \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dx dr &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}}^\infty (\widehat{\sigma}u + \widehat{\mu}) e^{-\frac{1}{2}u^2} du - \frac{L}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}}^\infty e^{-\frac{1}{2}u^2} du \\ &= \frac{\widehat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}}^\infty u e^{-\frac{1}{2}u^2} du + (\widehat{\mu} - L)\Phi\left(-\left(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right)\right)\end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi(z)$ is the cumulative distribution function of standard normal distribution. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\int_L^\infty \int_L^r \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} dx dr &= -\frac{\widehat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}u^2}\Big|_{\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}}^\infty + (\widehat{\mu} - L)\Phi\left(-\left(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{\widehat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2} + (\widehat{\mu} - L)\Phi\left(-\left(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right)\right)\end{aligned}$$

We use the same method for the lower integral to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\infty}^{L}\int_{r}^{L}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2}dxdr &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}}\int_{-\infty}^{L}(L-r)e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2}dr \\
&= \frac{L}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}}\int_{-\infty}^{L}e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2}dr - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma}}\int_{-\infty}^{L}re^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{r-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2}dr \\
&= \frac{L}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}u^2}du - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}}(\widehat{\sigma}u+\widehat{\mu})e^{-\frac{1}{2}u^2}du \\
&= (L-\widehat{\mu})\Phi\left(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right) - \frac{\widehat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}}ue^{-\frac{1}{2}u^2}du \\
&= (L-\widehat{\mu})\Phi\left(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right) + \frac{\widehat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore our Omega measure under a jointly normal distribution is

$$\Omega(R) = \frac{(\widehat{\mu}-L)\Phi\left(-\left(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right)\right) + \frac{\widehat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2}}{(L-\widehat{\mu})\Phi\left(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right) + \frac{\widehat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}})^2}} \tag{8.3}$$

Let $z = \frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega(R) &= \frac{-\widehat{\sigma}z\Phi(-z) + \frac{\widehat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2}}{\widehat{\sigma}z\Phi(z) - \frac{\widehat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2}} \\
&= \frac{-z\Phi(-z) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2}}{z\Phi(z) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2}}
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$G(z) = z\Phi(z) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2}$$

Then the Omega measure can be expressed as

$$\Omega(R) = \frac{G(-z)}{G(z)}$$

We claim that $\Omega(R)$ is a decreasing function. To see that, we first take the derivative of $G(z)$

$$\begin{aligned}
G'(z) &= \frac{z}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2} + \Phi(z) - \frac{z}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2} \\
&= \Phi(z)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Phi(z)$ is the jointly normal cumulative density distribution, $G'(z) \geq 0$ and $G(z)$ is an increasing function. However, since $G(z)$ is an increasing function, $G(-z)$ is a decreasing function, and $\Omega(R) = \frac{G(-z)}{G(z)}$ is a decreasing function. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{w_1,\ldots,w_n}\Omega(R) &\Leftrightarrow \min_{w_1,..,w_n}\frac{L-\widehat{\mu}}{\widehat{\sigma}} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \max_{w_1,..,w_n}\frac{\widehat{\mu}-L}{\widehat{\sigma}} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \max_{w_1,..,w_n} S(R)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, maximizing the Omega measure over $\{w_1, ..., w_n\}$ is equivalent to maximizing the Sharpe ratio over $\{w_1, ..., w_n\}$ with risk-free interest rate R_f equal to L.

■

Proof. of Proposition 5.1

A function $f(x)$ is quasi-concave if its upper level sets $\{x|f(x) \geq t\}$ are convex. The upper level sets of $S(w)$ form second order conic constraints, $w^T e \geq t\sqrt{w^T \Sigma w}$, which define convex regions.

■

Proof. of Theorem 5.3

Lemma 8.1. If $w^i = x^i$ but w^i is suboptimal for (4.2), then $\alpha^{i+1} > 0$ in the next iteration, unless there exists a $j \in P^i$ such that $w^i_j = 0$ and $p^{i+1}_j < 0$.

Proof. of Lemma 8.1

In the i^{th} iteration, from (5.2), we have $\Sigma_{P^{i+1}} w^i_{P^{i+1}} = \begin{bmatrix} e_{P^i} \\ e_k + \hat{\mu}^i_k \end{bmatrix}$, where $P^{i+1} = P^i \cup \{k\}$ and $\hat{\mu}^i_k = \sqrt{w^{iT} \Sigma w^i} \mu^i_k$. Taking the Cholesky decomposition, $\Sigma_{P^{i+1}} = LL^T$, we can write $L \begin{bmatrix} y^i_{P^i} \\ y^i_k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} e_{P^i} \\ e_k + \hat{\mu}^i_k \end{bmatrix}$ with $L^T w^i_{P^{i+1}} = y^i$. Since L^T is upper triangular, $L_{kk} w^i_k = y^i_k$, and so $y^i_k = 0$. Considering now the $i+1^{th}$ iteration, $\Sigma_{P^{i+1}} x^{i+1}_{P^{i+1}} = \begin{bmatrix} e_{P^i} \\ e_k \end{bmatrix}$, and similarly if $L^T x^{i+1}_{P^{i+1}} = y^{i+1}$ then $L \begin{bmatrix} y^{i+1}_{P^i} \\ y^{i+1}_k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} e_{P^i} \\ e_k \end{bmatrix}$. Since L is lower triangular, $y^{i+1}_{P^i} = y^i_{P^i}$, $y^{i+1}_k = y^i_k - \frac{\hat{\mu}^i_k}{L_{kk}}$, and so $x^{i+1}_k = \frac{-\hat{\mu}^i_k}{L^2_{kk}} = -\hat{\mu}^i_k \Sigma^{-1}_{kk}$. As w^i is not optimal, $\hat{\mu}^i_k < 0$, so assuming $p^{i+1}_j \geq 0$ for all $j \in P^i$ with $w^i_j = 0$, then for all $j \in P^{i+1}$, if $w^{i+1}_j = 0$ then $p^{i+1}_j \geq 0$, implying $\alpha^{i+1} > 0$. ■

Lemma 8.2. If $w^i = x^i$ but w^i is suboptimal for (4.2), then $S(w^{i+2}) > S(w^i)$ $\forall \alpha \in (0, 1]$.

Proof. of Lemma 8.2

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(w^{i+2}) &= S(w^{i+1} + \alpha(x^{i+1} - w^{i+1})) = S(w^i + \alpha(x^{i+1} - w^i)) \\
&= \frac{[w^i + \alpha(x^{i+1} - w^i)]^T e}{\sqrt{[w^i + \alpha(x^{i+1} - w^i)]^T \Sigma [w^i + \alpha(x^{i+1} - w^i)]}} \\
&= \frac{(1-\alpha) w^{iT} e + \alpha x^{i+1T} e}{\sqrt{[(1-\alpha)w^i + \alpha x^{i+1}]^T \Sigma [(1-\alpha)w^i + \alpha x^{i+1}]}} \\
&= \frac{(1-\alpha)\left(\Sigma^{-1}_{P^{i+1}} \begin{bmatrix} e_{P^i} \\ e_k + \hat{\mu}^i_k \end{bmatrix}\right)^T \begin{bmatrix} e_{P^i} \\ e_k \end{bmatrix} + \alpha x^{i+1T} e}{\sqrt{\left[(1-\alpha)\Sigma^{-1}_{P^{i+1}} \begin{bmatrix} e_{P^i} \\ e_k + \hat{\mu}^i_k \end{bmatrix} + \alpha x^{i+1}_{P^{i+1}}\right]^T \Sigma_{P^{i+1}} \left[(1-\alpha)\Sigma^{-1}_{P^{i+1}} \begin{bmatrix} e_{P^i} \\ e_k + \hat{\mu}^i_k \end{bmatrix} + \alpha x^{i+1}_{P^{i+1}}\right]}} \\
&= \frac{(1-\alpha) \begin{bmatrix} e_{P^i} \\ e_k + \hat{\mu}^i_k \end{bmatrix}^T x^{i+1}_{P^{i+1}} + \alpha x^{i+1T} e}{\sqrt{\left[x^{i+1}_{P^{i+1}} + (1-\alpha)\Sigma^{-1}_{P^{i+1}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \hat{\mu}^i_k \end{bmatrix}\right]^T \Sigma_{P^{i+1}} \left[x^{i+1}_{P^{i+1}} + (1-\alpha)\Sigma^{-1}_{P^{i+1}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \hat{\mu}^i_k \end{bmatrix}\right]}} \\
&= \frac{x^{i+1T} e + (1-\alpha)\hat{\mu}^i_k x^{i+1}_k}{\sqrt{x^{i+1T}\Sigma x^{i+1} + 2(1-\alpha)x^{i+1}_k \hat{\mu}^i_k + (1-\alpha)^2 (\hat{\mu}^i_k)^2 S^{-1}_{kk}}} \\
&= \frac{x^{i+1T} e + (1-\alpha)\hat{\mu}^i_k x^{i+1}_k}{\sqrt{x^{i+1T}\Sigma x^{i+1} + 2(1-\alpha)x^{i+1}_k \hat{\mu}^i_k - (1-\alpha)^2 x^{i+1}_k \hat{\mu}^i_k}} \qquad (8.4) \\
&= \frac{x^{i+1T} e + (1-\alpha)\hat{\mu}^i_k x^{i+1}_k}{\sqrt{x^{i+1T}\Sigma x^{i+1} + (1-\alpha^2)\hat{\mu}^i_k x^{i+1}_k}} \geq \frac{x^{i+1T} e + (1-\alpha^2)\hat{\mu}^i_k x^{i+1}_k}{\sqrt{x^{i+1T} e + (1-\alpha^2)\hat{\mu}^i_k x^{i+1}_k}} \\
&= \sqrt{x^{i+1T} e + (1-\alpha^2)\hat{\mu}^i_k x^{i+1}_k} > \sqrt{x^{i+1T} e + \hat{\mu}^i_k x^{i+1}_k} \\
&= \sqrt{w^{iT} e} = \frac{w^{iT} e}{\sqrt{w^{iT} e}} = \frac{w^{iT} e}{\sqrt{w^{iT}_{P^i} \Sigma_{P^i} \Sigma^{-1}_{P^i} e_{P^i}}} = \frac{w^{iT} e}{\sqrt{w^{iT}_{P^i} \Sigma_{P^i} w^i_{P^i}}} = \frac{w^{iT} e}{\sqrt{w^{iT} \Sigma w^i}} = S(w^i)
\end{aligned}
$$

■

The active-set algorithm is monotone increasing as for all i, $S(x^i) \geq S(w^i)$, and by the quasi-concavity of $S(w)$, this implies that $S(w^i + \alpha(x^i - w^i)) \geq S(w^i)$. In showing that the active-set algorithm is convergent, if w^0 is not optimal $S(w^2) > S(w^0)$ by Lemmas 8.1 and 8.2, and since $S(w^0) \geq S(w)$ for all portfolios w of size 1, $|P^i| \geq 2$ for all $i \geq 1$.

Assume now $x^i \neq w^i$, and this holds until $x^{i+m} = w^{i+m}$, where $m \leq n-2$ and $|P^{i+m}| \leq n-m$. If the solution is not optimal, there exists $q \leq n-m-2$ indices of P^{i+m} such that $w^{i+m+1}_j = 0$ and $p^{i+m+1}_j < 0$. After q iterations, there exists no $j \in P^{i+m+1+q}$ such that $w^{i+m+1+q}_j = 0$ and $p^{i+m+1+q}_j < 0$, so by Lemma 8.1, $\alpha^{i+m+1+q} > 0$ and by Lemma 8.2, $S(w^{i+m+2+q}) > S(w^{i+m+1+q}) \geq S(w^i)$. Assuming $m = 0$ considers the case where $x^i = w^i$, and so we have shown that the algorithm is strictly increasing after $m + 2 + q \leq n$ iterations.

Since the optimal value is bounded and the algorithm is strictly monotone increasing for intervals of n iterations, the algorithm converges. ■